

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/513,207	LI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arlen Soderquist	1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Arlen Soderquist. (3) Robert Stanley.
 (2) Barry D. Biddle. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant
 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11,19,20,23 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Karlberg and Doyle.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ARLEN SODERQUIST
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed changes to the claims to overcome the objections and clarity issues. Examiner indicated that the proposed changes would probably overcome the objections and clarity issues for claims 19-20 and 23-24. Applicant also proposed changes that would overcome the art rejections based on the Karlberg reference as the primary reference. These changes would specifically cite the ATR and kraft liquor stream as elements of the system of claim 11. Examiner indicated that these changes appear to be sufficient to overcome the art rejections based on Karlberg as the primary reference. Will consider the response when filed.